DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 083 088 SO 006 308

AUTHOR	Rabinowitz, Richard
TITLE	The Pedagogue's Panoplist. An Irregular Review of Heuristic Happenings at the Horace Mann Space Center, Museum Education Department, Old Sturbridge Village. Volume II, Number 3.
INSTITUTION	Old Sturbridge Village, Sturbridge, Mass. Museum Education Dept.
PUB DATE	1 May 73
NOTE	26p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*American Culture; Curriculum Development; Educational Facilities; Educational Innovation; Handicrafts; Inquiry Training; *Interdisciplinary Approach; Interior Space; Learning Activities; *Museums; Open Education; Program Development; School Design; *Social Studies; Staff Role; Staff Utilization; Teacher Workshops; Thematic Approach; *United States History

ABSTRACT

This issue of the Panoplist is devoted to a comprehensive review of Museum education at Old Sturbridge Village. The museum's collections support the educational purpose of providing an accurate knowledge of the arts, thought, and natural resources of 19th century New England. The program has made use of new educational techniques which apply to museum teaching, such as an interdisciplinary approach, open classrooms, and community and career oriented education. Thematic and conceptual approaches have been used for tours. The 1972-73 basic tours were farming, homelife, textiles, and government. The role of the tour escort has aimed at stimulating the group's own inquiry, deriving from Hilda Taba's concept formation and attainment models. A belief in the active involvement of children in the learning process has resulted in farming, textile, and cooking studios. Teacher programs have focused on curriculum development and innovative teaching techniques. Materials collected have been classified in a resource guide for teachers. The Museum Education Center has been designed to facilitate the Center's educational objectives. The history of staff development and a staff profile conclude the issue. (KSM)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 083088

SP 006 308

THE PEDAGOGUE'S PANOPLIST

An irregular review of heuristic happenings at the
Horace Mann Space Center, Museum Education Department, Old Sturbridge Village

Vol. II, No. 3 May 1, 1973 Whole No. 8

A Prefatory Comment

This issue of the Panoplist is devoted to a comprehensive review of Museum Education at Old Sturbridge Village. It has been written in response to many requests for information about our programs and how they developed. Regular readers of this review, which is ordinarily distributed only to the museum staff and a few others, may consequently be familiar with much of what is said here. For those whose efforts to read through this take as long as has the program to develop, I beg indulgence.

I make this explanation for the reason that without it many readers would suppose that all those characters in Museum Education had nothing better to do than to sit around and talk about themselves.

--The Author.

MUSEUM EDUCATION AT OLD STURBRIDGE VILLAGE

The educational program at Old Sturbridge Village begins with the premise of the museum itself. The Village, opened to the public first in 1946, has had a complex history, marked with changes in direction and focus, false starts and both minor and major successes. Its overall growth, especially in numbers of visitors, should not obscure this complexity. The 5,172 who came during the first year had a very different experience from the 667,991 who visited in 1972.

The Village began as a personal collection of artifacts, sometimes carefully selected and sometimes not, rich in a few areas (like Massachusetts tall clocks) and weak in others (like the work clothing of farmers and farmwives). Over the course of thirty-five years, curators have culled and strengthened this

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

collection. Occasionally, the collection has responded to new interpretive needs, especially in increasing its holdings in tools and machines; there have also been times when the curators have "edited" the museum interpretation by collecting finer nineteenth-century furniture and paintings as in the 1950's. In general, the collection has become an excellent repository of the material culture of rural New Englanders in the century after 1750. Acquisition continues, of course, as the museum grows, and better professional attention is now paid toward registration, curatorial research, artifact conservation and storage.

From the time when the founders of the Village purchased over 300 acres of land for a museum site in the town of Sturbridge (in the 1930's), it was evident that this would not be a collection of collections. The purpose of exhibiting the artifacts within contexts as close as possible to their original situations gave rise to the second major area of collecting, that of historic buildings themselves. Originally many of these buildings were reconstructions or less than scrupulous restorations, but there has been an extraordinary growth in sophistication in this regard. As standards of preservation and restoration have emerged, the care with which buildings are chosen, studied, moved and restored at Sturbridge has become an arduous and skilled area of museum technique. The choice of buildings, too, reflects the history of museum interpretation. The Baptist Meetinghouse, moved to its present site at the head of the "town common" in 1948, suggested that the Village might grow to represent the spatial configuration of real New England communities; its restoration as a meetinghouse and not as a display case meant that subjects like religious and political history would be parts of the museum's syllabus; and finally, that it was an 1832 building in the "new style" of the Greek Revival insured that the museum would break from its "colonial" moorings, and twenty years later have to recognize industrialization as a major historical theme. The acquisition of the Salem Towne House, called the "Mansion House" for too long after its move to Sturbridge in 1954, the Brooks Pottery in 1960, the Nash Cooper Shop in 1968, and various barns, sheds and outbuildings, signified the museum's awareness of its interpretive responsibilities in regard to higher and lower rungs on the economic ladder, although not the very lowest, to be sure. In the 1960's, the Thompson Bank, the McClellan Law Office and a small Maine carding mill, reflected new concerns with economic development. Plans for the next three major buildings--a second general store, an operating sawmill, and a cotton factory--will sustain this direction. In the longer range, the selection of mill tenements, a machine shop, a second full-scale farmstead, and others, will add vastly to the Village as a collection of "vernacular" buildings and living spaces.

A third major area of collections, that of work processes, has also been part of the museum intention for many years. In the 1940's, the notion that the museum could support a community of artisans had an almost Utopian quality. It became apparent over the next decade that the preservation of the economic viability of handcraft production and of the processes actually in use in early New England could not both be achieved; the result was the departure of those craftsmen and women whose cabinetmaking, clock repair or pottery could not be confined within the limits of an older technology and older design mode. The next

stage was to expand the representation of reproduction craftwork, including blacksmithing, woodworking, pewtering, weaving, printing, tinsmithing, broom making, pottery, coopering (a more difficult and rarer skill), and such household tasks as spinning, cooking, and candlemaking, and even such refinements as theorem and portrait painting. Both as an aid in interpretation (showing a complete process) and in merchandising, the products of these shops have been deliberately simple. In the last few years, however, the transformation of the Pliny Freeman Farm into a full-scale working unit, operating on the seasonal rhythms of a 100-acre farm of the year 1800, has altered the philosophy of interpretive demonstrations at the Village. The farm staff have shown visitors a wide array of quotidian tasks --fence building in winter, sugaring off in March and April, cultivating in the warmer months, processing grains after the harvest, butchering in December, dairying and tending animals through the year--which have not been overdosed with the affective message of the "crafts" program. And not only does the farm product get consumed on the farm itself, but it requires a substantial contribution from Village carpenters, blacksmiths and coopers to reproduce the tools needed for farm operations. This attention to the lowly labors of the community has in the last year been extended to historical housekeeping, reflecting new interests in women's work. There are now demonstrations of laundering, food preservation and preparation, "sick cookery," and other household skills; spinning and weaving, coloring, and sewing have been integrated with interpretation of the residences. (As will, it is hoped, dressmaking and the domestic manufacture of boots and hats.) In five or ten years, the production of cotton cloth on reproduction machines will surely extend our way of relating the work histories of early New Englanders.

These three collections--of artifacts, buildings and skills--have all intersected in a new collection of historical ideas which underpin museum interpretation. Gone are the days of self-sufficient communities and tightly knit families, of stable structures of life experiences and work roles, of the "cultural lag" of rural communities, of religious and political harmony. The idea of a tranquil and beneficent past has been discarded, and the need to interpret the very hardest of themes for a museum, namely the process of change, has become central. Whether the visitor, coming here from the bustle of urban America and its superhighways, can recognize that change is less certain. The development of a strong research department, and a well-focused library of 20,000 volumes on New England history, has been at the heart of this fourth collection.

These are the givens. Added together, they comprise a map of the museum's intent, as expressed in its latest revised statement of purpose:

> Old Sturbridge Village, a nonprofit educational institution, is a living museum of New England history. The plan of its collections and exhibits suggests a small New England town representative of many such communities in inland parts of the region during the years from 1790 to 1840.

The educational purposes of Old Sturbridge Village are to promote an accurate knowledge of the acts, thoughts and material resources of those who peopled early nineteenth-century New England, and to reveal some of the complexity of our heritage in the hope that, in such an encounter with the past, Americans will better understand who they are and how they came to be so.

The period portrayed by Old Sturbridge Village is that of the first half-century following the American Revolution, the winning of national independence, and the adoption of the Constitution. It was a time of change in the everyday lives of New Englanders in even the smallest communities, as the effects of the rise of manufacturing, improvements in agriculture and transportation, the pulls of emigration and urbanization, the tides of educational and social reforms, and new modes of fashion in homes and dress and manners transformed the landscape and mindscape of New England irrevocably. Most people who lived close to the soil lived equally close to such local problems as public schooling, the treatment of the poor and the Negro, and the diversity of religious and economic life.

To present this period of New England history to modern Americans, Old Sturbridge Village employs a wide variety of museum and educational techniques--authentically restored buildings, costumed interpreters, historical farming, craft demonstrations, formal exhibits, publications, and special programs for adults and for students of all ages and levels of experience and interests. Its ever-widening efforts in education, dependent upon careful research into the material and written sources of history, reflects the Village's commitment to nurturing a sense of the past as a vital extension of our lives.

So lengthy a preface to a description of the educational program is necessary because at Sturbridge, as in other museums, an educational design has generally followed curatorial and interpretive decisions. This is not to say that Old Sturbridge Village has not long been committed to responding to the visitors' needs for elucidation of its growing exhibit area. It is fair, though, to say that careful study of the educational methods to be employed in this process began only two or three years ago, and then only because the full richness of the museum as an agency of learning and teaching did not seem to be realized. Still today, the planning, curatorial, historical research and restoration activities for new exhibits like the Asa Knight Store all take place before the use of such a building in teaching is considered. This may not be a bad procedure, in fact, and certainly the teaching program benefits from the professionalism of other museum staff; it must be recognized, on the other side, that the research necessary for the selection, restoration and furnishing of such a building has only partial relevance to its educational functions.

The development of a new museum education program at Old Sturbridge Village depended on a number of other preconditions. First, the audience had to be located and attracted to the museum as part of its curriculum, or at least, as part of its school schedule. This has never been very difficult, as the numbers of teachers and students eager to visit Sturbridge has always outstripped the museum's ability to respond adequately. This year, dates were requested for 150,000 school-group visitors; we will have the space and staff to accommodate only 80,000 of these. The fact of the museum's popularity, warranted or not, is important, for the staff has always been able to presume that it didn't have to worry about attracting groups, and could therefore spend its time entirely in improvements upon the visit. Second, it was necessary for teachers to acknowledge a number of procedural constraints, and this too has been successful; all groups have advance reservations for a visit, they are willing to be distributed so that we can admit up to 400 each day, they generally plan for four-hour visits at least, enough adult chaperones are available, and so on. And third, the museum had (1) to decide to stay open all winter to serve school groups, and (2) to require that students tour the museum in groups of ten because of the limits imposed by the size of our period buildings. The latter decision, particularly, has had important educational consequences.

The intersection of these two givens--a vast and complex museum, on the one hand, and a large audience of school groups, on the other--is the center of the Museum Education Department's responsibility. How can the visit of these children to this historical resource be facilitated? It is crucial to see, at this point, that there can be easy or difficult answers to this question, depending on the ambition, foolhardiness or energy of the museum staff. Nothing in the question itself mandated the responses to be described in what follows. Certainly nothing in the Village's sense of itself insured that it would work so hard to match its museum teaching to the new currents of educational reform that emerged in the 1960's--in the more interdisciplinary approach of Edwin Fenton's "new social studies," in teacher retraining programs, in the development of inquiry-oriented curricula, in the transatlantic passage of the "open classroom," in the pressure for community- and career-related education, in the reshaping of curricular priorities around principles of cognitive development rather than upon the logic of academic disciplines, in the new view of the child's remarkable ability to master complex structures of linguistic and cultural behavior, and so on. Why should Old Sturbridge Village have decided, as only a few other museums have, to contribute its resources to these movements?

It would be flattering to overemphasize the institution's recognition of its responsibilities in this regard. The political truth is a bit more direct. Without the powerful support of Ruth Wells, the museum's first director and now a Trustee, such a plunge would not have occurred; her decision, expressed in challenge grants and tireless efforts to match those challenges by raising funds elsewhere, to see an exciting education program as a fitting memorial to her husband, George Burnham Wells, the first chairman of our Board of Trustees, turned a theoretical responsibility into an ongoing occasion for experimentation. And, in the four or five

years since Barnes Riznik, Vice-President for Museum Administration and Interpretation, began to press the program development ahead, Mrs. Wells's commitment has frequently kept open the question of how learning in the museum was to proceed. Let me begin to trace the program's evolution since 1969.

1. The Thematic Tour

First, it was clear that the museum had grown so large that it was no longer possible to see it easily within one day. Especially for schoolchildren, the seemingly endless succession of sensations generated only confusion and fatigue. Passing through room after room, filled with foreign objects, exemplified by alien work processes, discussed in unfamiliar language, the student was in no position to achieve an awareness of any aspect of nineteenth-century life. True, there were sporadic sparks which penetrated through the mist of miscellany, but these were quickly damped by the irrelevance of the next item in the sequence. Children might begin the day with questions of artifact identification--what's this, what's that?--but there was no way for them to move toward higher cognitive levels, except under the guidance of extraordinarily gifted (and rare) schoolteachers. Nor would any of these details be easily remembered, for there were few links to the child's own experience at home or in school. Far from illustrating the students' textbooks, as teachers hoped, or illuminating the children's sensitivity to historical objects and ideas, as the museum prayed it would, the field trip to Sturbridge was more likely an isolated reprieve from both school and family constraints.

Laudable as such a reprieve might be, it was unacceptable to the Village. Despite the helpfulness of costumed interpreters and demonstrators in the exhibit buildings, their assignment to particular stations could not induce the kind of linkages and development which were at the heart of the staff's notions of the learning process. (The ideas of Jerome Bruner were, in turn, at the core of these notions.) The solution appeared to be a thematic focus to the day's visit, not to produce experts in nineteenth-century farming (which was the first theme chosen) but to give students a handle on the entire exhibit message. If a child could observe the ways in which the farm family supplied much of its own needs, he or she would then be prepared to view the general store as the source of other goods, and not simply as a further collection of strange looking things.

By the summer of 1971, after two years of trial, it was recognized that the tours were approaches to the study of a distinct historical community. Over the next school year, tours on family life and textile production were added to the core program, and many others were tried. Implicit in this was the choice of community study as the major area of program concentration, and other possibilities--artifact study, the history of the early national period--were regarded only as types of information which might or might not be introduced into the museum visit. This is to say that a distinctly anthropological (or economic or geographical) slant

became predominant, and the names of Thomas Chippendale or Andrew Jackson could be safely ignored.

In 1972-73, four basic tours were offered to school groups: Farming, Homelife, Textiles and Government, the last directing itself most forcefully to the idea of community. Within each area, the relevant concepts and generalizations have been extracted, mostly by the experience of the staff in teaching and not by predesign. The tendency now is to move toward a conceptual framework, organizing tours around such problems as Making a Living, Making Community Decisions, Living Together as a Family, Growing Up, and so on, using the evidence derived from agricultural or domestic or industrial exhibits as they relate to each problem. Even now, the exhibit areas are used quite differently by each tour. At the Pliny Freeman Farm, a textiles group might look for the first stages of the cloth-making process, either at the field of flax or at the sheep to be shorn in May. A homelife group would be looking at the garden, at cheese making, or at food preparation as the province of a woman's contribution to the livelihood of the family. A farm group could map the fields according to their uses, and see how the farmer's work in coopering might add to the family income during the slack winter season. A government tour might question the farmer's lack of prescribed fences, his need for roads and town schooling, or the precise standards by which the size of his barrels is regulated.

It is possible that in two or three years the themes will themselves disappear, either because the group's day will be tailored especially for it by preplanning with the teacher, or because the teaching staff will find ways to use the Village without the set plans which underlay each thematic tour now. It is hard to know whether the museum can become a vast open classroom, but it is tantalizing to think so, and not least because in the process of "opening" up the classroom, the English primary schools of the 1940's also went through a period of thematic concentrations.

2. The Escorted Tour

The institution of thematic tours, it should be inserted quickly, could be accomplished only by providing each group of ten students with a museum staff escort. The escorts are paraprofessional teachers, mostly drawn from the local community or from the ranks of recent college graduates who see the work as a form of museum internship. There are now almost thirty escorts, who work between two and five days per week. They meet each group at the beginning of its visit, and lead the children through all of a day's investigation. They are instructed not to replace, but to supplement, the interpretation offered by the costumed staff in the historic area. On any given day during the spring of 1973, 150 of the 400 visiting students are being escorted in three tours on the Homelife theme, and four each on Farming, Textiles and Government. In addition, there may be another fifty to one hundred students engaged in various special programs

--to be described further on--and some of these require escorts as well. High-school students are generally not offered tours, and are not expected to travel through the Village in groups. All groups not offered tours are given a twenty-minute briefing, comprising both historical information and procedural directions for the visit: the teachers or parents who lead these groups are given written guides to assist their progress through the museum. We are hardly satisfied with the educational experience of nonescorted groups, except as they provide a constant check on the putative value of our escorted tours, and further experimentation with programs for these groups is now proceeding.

3. Experiments with the Learning Process in the Museum

The escort's role is not to provide a didactic, lecture-type guided tour to the Village. From the first, the aim has been to stimulate the group's own inquiry, to promote the development of concept learning, and to provide flexible and resourceful assistance to the child's efforts to make sense of this environment. The staff has tried more or less rigorous applications of various inductive teaching strategies, largely derived from Hilda Taba's concept formation and concept attainment models. One is consequently unlikely to hear the traditional litany of museum teaching--"this is a ...," "that is a... ." Whether the current mode, built around questions like "what do you suppose this was used for?" or "what would a family do in this room?" is more valuable, is a matter of great concern.

To raise the level of cognition in the museum field study, a wide array of data retrieval devices have been tried, including charts, mapping, drawing, photography and sound recording. All have been somewhat successful, but the instruments tend to be cumbersome, and the tasks burdensome to children whose attention to farm animals and crafts like pottery can be zealous. Much of the effort of data retrieval as a learning activity founders, too, on the poor application of the lists, groups and labels which are collected. Is there a point to spending much time during the precious few hours of the museum visit in a classroom-like review of the students' notes, or in the development of verbal generalizations which may not truly answer the curiosities of a child in the three-dimensional exhibit area? If only to know that the children have learned something that we can see, we hope for such expression; such is the plight of the museum teacher. But it seems better to reserve such review for the classroom itself; it is there, in any case, that teachers will have to face the challenge of directing further inquiry.

The aim of generating more sophisticated kinds of learning coincides with another, that of increasing the child's active involvement in the learning process. We all know, from our own school years at least, that children can learn concepts and remain passive in the process. We may also have noticed, from our early adulthood and parental experience, that kids' activity can easily be misconstrued as learning. Obviously the two are not as distinct as hard-line school administrators have apparently thought, nor as tightly conjoined as advocates of open

education like Charles Silberman have presumed.

Be that as it may, the active involvement of children in learning presents special problems for the museum educator. At a place like Old Sturbridge Village the ease with which interpreters move about their spaces and their tasks is a major contributor to the air of authenticity of the re-created village, but it is a heady invitation to the frustration of visitors who cannot taste this familiarity for themselves. In some measure authenticity depends upon this "unshared" familiarity, for it is hard to imagine the interpretation of Hervey Brooks's craftsmanship being clarified by having 8,000 experimenters at a reproduction of his potter's wheel. Museum education staff learn to smirk at the way outdoor education people or representatives from museums without collections of antiques talk about involvement; visions of terrified curators dance in our heads.

Although there may be no such special gift as "a tactile sense of American history," as claimed by some, it can be allowed that trying to cook a meal over an open fire may have cognitive as well as affective meaning. The school world effectively stratifies its population into "high-achievement" and "low-achievement" classes, and associates verbal facility with the former and manipulative skills with the latter. A museum, despite its often explicit class bias as the preserver of scarce commodities, should not fall into the same fallacy.

At Sturbridge, there were "touch tables" for kids fifteen years ago, a summer craft-oriented "Old-Time Youngsters" program for the past decade, and, beginning in the mid-1960's, a crafts participation period as part of the regular visit day. Children had the chance to explore for about twenty minutes such skills as candlemaking, spinning and weaving, printing or bullet molding. These short encounters were characterized by a brief lecture-demonstration, and a "one-child-at-a-time" invitation to try one's hand at such ancient mysteries of home and shop. But the crafts participation was deliberately designed to avoid being too closely linked to the rest of the visit, if one printed, one did not also see the printer at work. The logic of this was strictly economic; it permitted more children to visit Old Sturbridge Village without overburdening the exhibit areas.

A significant advance was begun in the fall of 1969, with the establishment of the "farm module," then conceived to be an experimental prototype for the teaching areas in a proposed education center. Children seated around a circular table were encouraged to identify a dozen farm tools (sickle, husking pin, switchel ring), to see each of these in use through slides taken at the Freeman Farm, to talk a bit about how the "farm family satisfied its need for food," and then to try out a series of farm tasks (pitching hay, winnowing, husking and shelling corn) in a second room. All this took place in the School Services area (as it was then called), and was preparatory to an escorted tour of the farm itself. The "module" was not entirely unsuccessful, and it received much favorable comment from teachers during its two years of intermittent operation. It was apparent, though, that it was a highly formal learning experience, in which much of the affective power of working with careful reproductions of real tools was dissipated by the

classroom manner of highly directive teaching. How children were to "read" unfamiliar artifacts without falling into the tensions and mirths of a guessing game was an unresolved question, and the whole process could be disrupted too easily by the students' refusal to play along. The farm module was too transparent an exemplification of its teaching strategy; the clarity of its "cognitive map" did not account for how or why children were to enter upon such routes, and where this experience would lead them.

Still, extremely valuable precedents were established. In the fall of 1971, a new professional staff converted the module (and banished the term) into a freer learning "studio," or most simply, a "farmspace" (in conjunction with which the new building, then nearing design completion, was waggishly dubbed "The Horace Mann Space Center"). The intention of the studio, still imperfectly achieved, was to provide: tools to examine and work with; slides of the "farmer's year" in the Village, and also of historical paintings of farms; maps and models of farms; farmers' diaries and account books--all to be explored in connection with an escorted tour focusing on the farm economy or the agricultural community. In practice, escorts still tightly structure the group's explorations, but there are continuing experiments with ways of opening up the studio to easier student access. The problem of the farm studio is partly due to the difficulty of contextualizing work processes so that children can see the end products of their work. Too, there has been some confusion about the conceptual focus of the farm tour; should it deal with how the farm family provided its income, how it used its spaces, what interactions it had with the ecological environment, or how it functioned as a technological system?

Though the farming studio was the first, it has lagged behind later efforts to offer significant manipulative activities to school groups. In the winter of 1971-72, cooking was introduced as the featured activity of a family life tour. Despite its peregrinations through the museum in search of a convenient fireplace--awaiting the new building which will have four of them--it was quickly apparent that cooking over an open fire from a period "receipt" and using ingredients with the same lack of precision and packaging that characterized nineteenth-century kitchens has been extremely successful. Kitchen activities are easy enough for children, familiar enough for the unfamiliarities to be understood; and the fact that the group consumed its products (corn bread, hasty pudding, stew) was a powerful educational stimulus. It also provides time for discussion of family work roles, of the use of living and working spaces in the home, and of the process of socialization.

The third area of work process to be opened for students has been textile production. The old spinning and weaving demonstration lesson, with its verbal emphasis upon such terms as "retting" or "hetchels," has given way to a rapid initiation of children into the work of carding by hand, of spinning (with drop spindle and spinning wheel), of weaving (on both a tape loom and a full-scale loom). There is time, too, for examining the flax and wool process from field and barn to the sewing of garments. But all of this has been subsumed, to some

extent, under the study of industrialization. Children assess how each of the processes changed with the development of New England mill villages, and they read together in the diaries and accounts of both home and mill workers.

In fact, students on a textiles tour generally take the roles of members of the William Davis family of Oxford, Massachusetts, which underwent the transition from farm to factory labor 150 years ago, and whose records the staff has collected and edited in extraordinary detail. The climax of the day's textiles tour has been the family discussion about the wisdom of such a move from the farm; the need to infer from the museum's resources the bases for deciding either way has sharpened the group's investigation of the farm family's life considerably.

The textiles studio is an effort to offer children the mastery of a skill, and in a half-hour they often do begin learning to spin. Cooking, on the other hand, is essentially a simulation activity, as the skills are not terribly new or difficult to students. Both simulation and manipulative activities change the relationship of the student to the museum as a learning environment. The child suspends his identity as student (or as social science investigator--which is projected for him by much of the "new social studies") and is cast forcefully into the situational gestalt of the nineteenth-century community. This has been most noticeable in the fourth area of regular escorted tours, those on government. Here children are assigned names and demographic information of people who lived in nineteenth-century Sturbridge, and led out to examine how each would have needed governmental services and protection in the nineteenth century. They then proceed to organize the government of the town, electing selectmen and fence viewers and constables, and voting on such issues as the construction of a new road to link with the turnpike, or permitting a tannery to locate in the town, or providing a high-school education for the town's children. After an hour of heated debate in the government studio, it is clear that the students have not only attained the concepts about government and community which are important to new social studies curricula, but they have exemplified these concepts in decision-making and predictive activities.

The adoption of kinetic activity and simulation as parts of the daily program in Museum Education has resulted from the staff's observation that children of upper elementary and junior high-school grades--for whom they were designed --are best approached through teaching strategies which underplay, especially in the museum visit, the attainment of verbal generalizations. The relevance of this observation to Jean Piaget's descriptions of the "concrete operational" patterns of learning of students at this age has not passed unnoticed, and the staff is slowly working toward greater refinements in program design according to age and cognitive level.

Even more basic, however, is the need for sound evaluation of these teaching programs. For Sturbridge, as for most other museum education programs, evaluation has been sporadic and usually impressionistic. It is always easier to describe one's program intentions than to examine what in fact is happening in the

minds of children. Nor is the progress of the program--and the illumination of its detail--much aided by the traditional measures of success, e.g., the student's return visit to the museum at some later date. We need to know how this single day of learning--presumed, perhaps audaciously, to have some impact on the child--has altered the child's capabilities. Ah, but then, his capabilities to do what? What do we really hope to attain through all this experimental programming? To know about "how people lived"? Far too imprecise, we reply, for who can know that? To describe how the life of the farm family intersected with that of the community, or how work processes contributed to the family's livelihood? Closer, perhaps, but still not adequate. Don't we care, too, about the child's ability to describe the contrasting conditions of his own family's work, homelife and community? Don't we sense, in addition, that "description" may be a deceptive test of the student's cognition, and that nonverbal concept learning needs its own nonverbal tests?

It may be answered that you can't know what you want to do until you know what you can do. Still, there is some danger in endlessly adding little wrinkles onto the face of the program, describing each unqualifiedly as an innovation. Having come this far, the program has matured to the point where it requires rigorous evaluation, if only to legitimatize our perplexities, but hopefully, too, to suggest some clear directions for further program development. To this end, we have designed and applied for funding for a research project entitled, "Evaluation of Learning Outcomes of Field Studies in an Outdoor History Museum." It is expensive to conduct research as scrupulously as we intend, and writing the proposal for this project suddenly demanded an attention to the educational research taking place in all sorts of larger academic centers. With that awareness, it was also suddenly clear that such a project could not have only parochial goals, directed toward our own program development. If our evaluation research takes its structure from the professional discipline, so too its significance must be measured in national terms. How can Old Sturbridge Village play a role, then, in the development of the learning process in other outdoor museums, and in field education generally, as that area becomes more important to the schools world? How can Old Sturbridge Village aid in the development of new evaluative procedures for nonverbal or informal or "de-schooled" learning experiences? Such questions are important in marking the progress of the education program from the givens of the museum to its wider implications for American education.

Needless to say, the funding for such an evaluation study will be difficult to achieve, either from museum budgets or from outside funding agencies. The dismantling of federal support for educational research and innovation by the Nixon Administration makes dubious any aid from that quarter; federal programs for support of museums have to be convinced of the need for educational evaluation itself, a difficult task at best. Even the Village's support for the staff while it seeks out funding from other sources is not assured.

4. Special Programs

Although the four-hour class field study at Old Sturbridge Village is the most central concern of the Museum Education Department, it offers only limited opportunities for educational experimentation. The dynamic of the department's growth has been fed equally by the chance to design much more elaborate field studies, often extending over several days. The major impact of these special programs has been to extend the staff's awareness of the richness of the Village as an educational resource. By focusing on such questions as technological change or family and women's history, the department has tried to integrate its research interests in New England history with the educational responsibilities of teaching in a museum environment.

In many cases the special programs have been the first trials for elements of the core program of escorted tours. A town meeting on building a high school was first held for a class visiting overnight from New Jersey. Four groups of ten students had toured the Village during the day, discussing how such a school would affect the economic life, the family, the educational process and the government of the community--all in preparation for their town meeting, which was held at night in the Village Meetinghouse with great success. On other occasions, such town meetings have been held at school after the visit, sometimes with staff in attendance.

Special programs have also tested the viability of constructing major curriculum units around the study of the early nineteenth-century community. Staff members have been assigned the responsibility of working with teachers to coordinate month- or semester-long units, which may involve as many as ten visits to the museum. For two years an experimental project to teach physics through an analysis of the Village as a mechanical environment has encouraged students to follow up their group visits with individual research projects using museum materials.

With college students, in particular, the program has emphasized research into new questions about historical communities--their ecology, geography, literary taste, political culture, technology, demography, industrialization, psychohistory, family interactions, education, social structure, economic development, architecture and spatial arrangement. In addition to examinations of the physical evidence, students have been introduced to primary written documents of a type rarely seen by undergraduates--public records, manuscript diaries, letters and account books, newspapers and period literature, and so on. And most interesting, the students have been given the opportunity to learn in a wide variety of ways--through tours, group and individual research projects, experimenting with work processes, simulating community events, as well as discussions and readings. The most ambitious of these projects was the two-week field study by ten students from Skidmore College in January 1973, which surveyed many of these questions, sources and learning activities, and included an overnight "live-in" (and a ladies' missionary society meeting) in the Richardson House.

Such programs take a significant amount of time away from administrative and supervisory responsibilities, but they also contribute substantially to the intellectual nurture of the department. It is easy to overestimate their share of the professional staff's time by reading the reviews of such programs in The Pedagogue's Panoplist.

Among the most successful of our special programs has been a ten-week work-study internship for college students. Begun in 1969, the work-study program has brought more than thirty students to the museum, and divided their time between interpretive work with Village visitors and a research project on New England local history. Both aspects of the program have had extraordinary results. The students, in their roles as interpreters, have piloted new interpretive content and methods, including thematic tours for adults and simulations of period events (campaign speeches on the Adams-Jackson contest of 1828 were orated on the Common in 1972). Their research has made significant contributions to our understanding of community development, women's history, the lives of mill workers, local political culture, conflicts between parents and teachers, and other subjects. In addition, being a work-study intern has served as an important stage in their intellectual and career development initiating students into the skills of historical scholarship and into an interest in the public educational responsibilities of museums. As colleges seek for better learning opportunities for their students in off-campus environments, this program is likely to expand upon its past successes.

5. Teacher Programs

The most significant audience for special programs is composed of classroom teachers. Teachers have always represented the largest single occupational group among visitors to the museum, even when not accompanying their classes. In addition, we have recognized that a new museum education program at Sturbridge would have little impact on the schools unless teachers were brought intimately into the planning. The energy of program innovation might easily result in the production simply of more entertaining field trips if the experience at the Village was not made part of the teachers' curriculum.

But integrating a museum syllabus into that of the schools has suffered from another disadvantage. With groups visiting from hundreds of different districts--each in New England with autonomy over curriculum, it has not been possible to design a program from the "top down," beginning with school administrators and pressing for adoption by classroom teachers. Inevitably, then, the integration of teachers into the planning of museum education has been tied to the process of giving teachers themselves more control over curriculum decisions. But this seeming disadvantage has also offered the opportunity of considering Village efforts to reach teachers as a form of teacher training; this discovery has had immeasurable consequences for the museum's direction as an educational institution.

The Village has hosted in-service training workshops for teachers for many years, some from state colleges and universities and others from federally sponsored E.S.E.A. Title III programs in Massachusetts and Connecticut. These visits coincided with the establishment of a Title III project, "The Resource Learning Laboratory," in the town of Sturbridge. This project, which ran from 1968 to 1971, developed curricula around the use of field-study resources and trained teachers in innovative classroom strategies. With its completion, the museum entered into a partnership with about twelve Massachusetts school districts and with Clark University in an extension of the R.L.L. model. The new project, called "The Three-Dimensional Project," also received Title III funding, and has come, in its first two years (1971-73), to represent an exciting model for museum-school collaboration in the techniques of innovative education.

"The Three-Dimensional Project" has focused on teacher training. It has brought about thirty teachers each year to a two-week summer workshop and eight "call-back" Friday-Saturday meetings through the school year. Although the project has been funded outside the regular museum budget, it has been housed at Old Sturbridge Village and has included Museum Education staff both as instructors and participants. The result has been the intertwining of our developing notions about the educational possibilities of museums and our concern for the role of the teacher in school reform. In its attention to curriculum development, the Title III project has encouraged teachers to develop a curriculum model for the use of Old Sturbridge Village and of another, more local, community resource. This has sustained the museum staff's sense that the Village could be used as an alternative, or contrasting, community for field study. And in its focus on the learning process--how strategies are conceived and implemented, how objectives and learning experiences are designed and evaluated--the Title III project has introduced sig. ficant new directions in social studies pedagogy to a museum staff largely unaware of them before.

In more practical terms, the project's insistence upon working with a broad range of experienced and new teachers, and its emphasis on public school problems, has pushed the museum away from concentrating on especially gifted private school teachers as an audience for its new programs. But most critically, the example of teacher consultation in planning for museum visit programs has led to a new application procedure for all school groups. In 1972-73, visiting teachers were asked to describe their educational objectives before a date was scheduled. This enabled the staff to decide if escorted tours should be offered, what special emphasis might be given the tours to match the teachers' and students' goals, and how we could help the preparation and follow-up of these visits by arranging a previsit consultation or by supplying staff-developed educational materials for classroom use. Since reservations for group visits have been vastly oversubscribed, the application also permitted us to insure that the most fitting requests for our space and time could be accommodated on the scheduling chart.

Offering a Saturday each month for teachers to come to the Village and work with us on planning their visits proved to be quite popular; most sessions

have attracted more than twenty teachers, some of whom have come from as far as the New York City area. The success of the teacher consultations, the new application form, and "The Three-Dimensional Project," together with numerous other visits made by museum staff to schools and to teacher meetings, have confirmed our hopes to create a "Teachers' Center" at Old Sturbridge Village. For the next school year, 1973-74, we plan to offer teacher workshops in at least three areas: (1) the design of field-study experiences as part of a curriculum; (2) the retraining and preservice training of teachers in innovative teaching techniques; and (3) the incorporation of such content areas as family history, ecological study, community study, artifact analysis, the economics of work, and others, into the classroom syllabus.

These workshops will be offered more broadly than have the Title III sessions, and may in fact be organized within school districts or through other professional organizations or colleges. One prime audience for such expanded programming is the alumni group of teachers from our previous endeavors, this suggesting that the Village might become an ongoing resource center for teachers. Such a center might be considered a model for the role of nongovernmental agencies in educational innovation. It might also provide an institutional basis for experimentation in at least three other major problems of school-museum collaboration: (1) the development of community resource specialists within the schools; (2) the politics of teacher-school relationships in questions of team teaching, released time and in-service training; and (3) the training of other community resource people--in business, government, and local historical agencies--in responding to teacher and student needs.

6. Materials

New teaching programs and invitations for college students and teachers to redefine the Village are all occasions for a firsthand confrontation with the primary sources of the past. New ways of looking at the museum's collection and at its correspondence in the twentieth-century community beyond our gates have demanded that the Museum Education staff, similarly, return to the visual and written records with new questions. For the historians and the teachers who work here, this has been among the most exciting of our challenges.

In the process, and with the aid of our Curatorial and Research colleagues on the Village staff, many documents have been incorporated into our museum teaching. The records of a Killingly, Connecticut, school in the 1830's and 1840's reshape our perceptions of the experience of students in buildings like the Candia Schoolhouse in the museum, as do paintings of nineteenth-century children or woodcuts from period spellers and readers. To the powerful cognitive and affective messages of the Pliny Freeman Farm in spring can be added the recorded drama of a farmer's diary jottings about the harvesting of the crops in autumn, or about the year-to-year economic struggles of his family to get ahead in their world.

The museum world is flooded with disquisitions, learned or otherwise, about learning from or with artifacts, but this may be a false issue. Too often claims for the special value of visual learning neglect the prior experience of students with verbal logics. The question might better be posed, then, in terms of the interrelationship between words and things, especially as most learning through objects will eventually be expressed in verbal statements. A house and the nineteenth-century inventory of its furnishings contribute mutually to a dialectic of hypothesis and verification of each other; at best, each may then converge in more sophisticated assumptions about the experience of people with such spaces. But, further, the kinds of hypotheses engendered by each variety of primary source materials tend to pin each other down, to localize each document in space and time. A census return suggests questions chiefly about the statistical frequency of its diverse entries, and of their correlations. With accompanying maps and physical reminders of the area surveyed, it becomes possible to revisualize each family's participation in the distribution of population on the land, or of work functions in the economy. A period cookbook as a social historian's source may reveal much about attitudes toward domestic labor; when combined with the artifacts and processes of its contemporary kitchen, it may be possible to consider the relation of technology and economy to women's work, of diet and health to social structure, even of the collapsing interface between family behavior and national cultural norms. Finally, the written and physical record can in conjunction amplify our comprehension of the morphology of cultural experience. The modifications made by a carpenter to the prescriptions of a builder's design book, or the entries made of transactions in a country store, are each proofs of the deficiency of only one kind of primary source.

But all this relates to the use of written materials in the museum setting, to refining the reliability of the visual environment as a historical source. It is equally valuable to provide such resources to teachers and students for classroom use, to help prepare the group for a visit to Old Sturbridge Village and for following up on the visit when back in school. In addition, the museum has some responsibility to those groups which cannot, for reasons of expense or distance, visit Sturbridge. The effort to produce classroom materials began in earnest in 1969-70 by contracting for such services with a New York curriculum development firm. After two years, it was clear that the sets of slides and teaching aids produced were inadequate in themselves and too divorced from the rest of the education program's development, particularly in opening up new content areas for investigation and in teacher training. The termination of the contract led to a plan for in-house development of materials.

The first stage of this plan called for the establishment of a "data-bank" of relevant historical documents, chiefly discovered through special programs for college students and teachers. In the first year, more than 700 pages of primary documents, most of them edited from manuscripts, public records and research in published sources, have been made available to teachers at a nominal charge. Each document was classified by a number derived from the Human Relations Area File system, and described in a "Resource Guide" sent free to teachers.

The Resource Guides--on Family Life, Farming, Education, Government and Textiles--included suggestions for classroom activities with these materials, sources for further study, as well as price lists for documents and books sold through the Village's Bookstore. In addition, an orientation slide set--with thirty views of the Village, a script and other aids--was marketed in similar fashion.

Although the sales of the data-bank documents and slides have not been disappointing, they are clearly difficult for teachers to use directly. The historical sources, even when edited and annotated, are still best used as the stuff from which lessons can be planned, or as inducements to teachers to locate parallel sources for their own communities or for modern comparisons. The availability of this library of materials permitted our efforts in teacher training to turn away from instruction in historical research techniques, and toward problems of application. The premise has been that we should not be in the business of creating entire curricular kits, but rather that we should make our resources available to teachers in planning their own.

Working with teachers, though, has pushed our development to the point of offering more concrete help. For the summer teachers' workshop in 1973, conceptual models for the study of the family, of work, and of community life are being designed. Without becoming a packaged curriculum, each will offer materials--both documents and reproduction artifacts--which can be used by students themselves, as well as suggestions for organizing the learning activities within a particular sequence. Perhaps the clearest illustration is to point to the development of the "Labor Game," in which masses of economic data will be integrated into a simulation game based on the economic choices of real Sturbridge families in the 1810's and 1820's.

The materials program will surely change focus and direction as it continues to experiment with carrying the museum into the school and college. The key decision, to integrate that experimentation into our work with teachers, should continue to push museum education out into a new role in responding to client-designed educational programming.

One final word on this aspect of our work. The instructional needs have, in this case, stimulated a considerable amount of historical scholarship by our staff, of a type qualitatively distinct from other areas of museum research. Our interest in the way ordinary people interact with their cultural and physical environment is dependent upon, but not limited to, establishing the accuracy of that re-created environment. Concerned more for the "villager's" transaction with the storekeeper than for the enumeration of the objects on that worthy's shelves, we find that we cannot derive our teaching materials from the results of curatorial scholarship alone. Already a vast amount of research on the collective biographies of Sturbridge residents in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries has been accomplished, and an outline of a major community study has been organized. Experimental teaching programs have, we have found, an important influence in

generating experimental historical methodologies. Such linkages should be encouraged and explored in detail.

7. The Museum Education Center

A museum can be a ceaselessly changing educational place. The 400 students who pass through the Village on Monday are quite different from their compeers on Tuesday, and if the staff and the program are flexible enough, there can be extraordinary opportunities for renewing one's experimentation each day. Nothing could be more lethal in this process than too tight an institutionalization of the work, and no more concrete a form to that institutionalization than the construction of a new building to house the program. Sensitive architects these days are having severe depressions in contemplating the destruction which some of their efforts have wrought on innovative programs--in education, research or administration--which began, as ours has, in jerry-built, haphazardly arranged spaces.

The challenge of creating a Museum Education Center has, therefore, always carried with it a threat. Fortunately, this was realized quite early on in the planning. Since the firm of Rogers . Moore & Associates of Cambridge, Massachusetts, was selected for the job in the summer of 1970, scarcely a week has passed without a meeting to discuss some aspect of the building among the architects and the Village's educational and administrative staff. The result is that John Rogers and Allen Moore have had much influence on the direction of the program, and that we, correspondingly, have never let the design get too far away from the warning signals which have flashed from our educational experiments. Aside from the sheer joy of such collaboration, the process itself has encouraged us to work toward allowing the building a malleability in the hands of its future users.

Small wonder, then, that the exterior appearance of the building was almost the last question to be posed. We started with the need to find shape for the teaching spaces, seeking an arrangement that would not tie us to one teaching mode or to one set of specific themes. There were early and soon-forgotten discussions about elaborate exhibits for children or about separating teaching from storage spaces. Conversely, other assumptions--that the basic student group was ten students, that intellectual and kinetic activities should be intermixed, that the building should not be a simulation of an historic structure--were sustained. More and more, the building became in our minds a resource and reference "stack," not to compete with the in-Village tour but to supplement it with activities that were incompatible with the ever-refined anthropological reality of the historic environment--the materials and the time to try out work processes, to engage in simulation and role-playing activities, to "read" the visual and documentary sources which underlie the Village's alien realism. And, finally, we came to want a building that would reach out to other educational spaces--to

schools, libraries, community centers--by being as much a part of twentieth-century education as they. The building became, in fact, a double bridge, connecting with the historical and anthropological resources of the museum, and also with the innovative educational world beyond our gates.

This is not to say that we adopted any available modern school format, but rather that the building should be judged as a modern educational environment and not for its resemblance to older spaces. In fact, several important features of the Center derived from our criticism of present-day school architecture; we were dismayed especially by its lack of vertical dimensionality and by the cold, barn-like volume of "open schools." We were aware that children need particularly the chance to look down on spaces, and to anticipate in their transit through the building the kinds of activities they may be engaged in that day. The Center, thus, provides for school groups to enter on a bridge to the second level, there to walk along ramps overlooking the studios below, seeing other children at work in spinning or cooking or threshing as they go. We also recognized that we needed to give students a space they could dominate once their activity in the building began. From the ramps, then, they are led to 16' x 16' "pods" on the second level hanging over the studios, where they are introduced to the thematic focus of their day. They may then either return to the ramp, and leave the building to begin their tour of the Village, or they may descend from the pods (four feet) to the irregularly shaped studio space below. Here, there are group activities and individual explorations of aspects of their theme, perhaps best described as an open classroom of period sources. (The objects in use are designed to be quite accurate reproductions of antiques in the Village collections, in order to preserve the work process as close to the original as possible.) The appearance of the studios will, we hope, take its cue from the group's activity. We have discovered that it is best to use "magic marker" and easel pads for drawing and for lists, rather than more permanent materials, since this diminishes our anxiety about parting with the products of the students' work.

The double fireplaces for cooking are the only design features which dictate the use of a particular space. But even here, the studios may be used with tours studying work and community as well as family life. In every other space, the Center can be reshaped to deal with new content areas, new activities, just as it can be used with adults and family groups as part of their visit, or with teachers as elements in their training. The studios are not divided by walls from one another, and a group studying the textile process could visit the cooking area if the escort wanted to raise other questions about work roles in the family, and so on. Still, the studios are each clearly demarked by small level changes throughout the building. Since we were building into a hillside, the design could provide for two-foot drops from one studio to the next. The effect of this, we hope, is to maintain the group's dominance of and focus on one particular studio, and still provide easy access between them. Within the studios, the sense should be of three distinct areas, one twenty feet under the ceiling of the building, one in the accompanying pod (only up a four-foot staircase), and one under the next studio's pod (giving the sense of a tuck-in space with an eight-foot ceiling). At this point, the verbal

description gets even more inadequate.

Around the central core of seven studios and their pods are the ramps, and around them the offices, small closed classrooms (for quieter discussions), staff lounge, library and work spaces, and a Music Room to be used for seminars and conferences, where the group may number as many as sixty at a time. Leaving the building at the lower level, you walk around the hillside, cross the Quinebaug River, and find yourself on a path through one of Pliny Freeman's farm fields. Surely the best way to begin one's perceptions of an agricultural community.

I have spoken earlier about the need for educational evaluation; clearly our new building, scheduled now to open in November 1973, also needs careful (and continuing) review. Fortunately, though, the program has not waited for the completion of construction, and the first tide of children out of their buses and across the bridge should not be seen as the inauguration of something dramatically new. At its best, the Museum Education Center will enter into a fruitful dialogue with its participants, will generate and be responsive to change. The design of the Center has been one sort of accomplishment, to be looked upon with a little irony as the photograph of its maturation replaces the blueprint of its youth.

8. The Staff

How does one collect and organize a Museum Education staff to work with architects, to develop curricular materials, to train teachers, to initiate and train escorts for a new set of thematic tours, to research new historical questions, to administer a working group of forty-five people, to write and speak clearly about the program, to help in fund raising, to share in the growth of other museum projects? Obviously, no one comes to us with such skills. No museum training program currently sends its graduates out knowing how to do all this. Sometimes, as with the new building, one can turn to outside technical assistance, but only if one is prepared to spend hours following their work faithfully. On other occasions, as in the curriculum materials work, going outside the museum can be a dismal failure.

This dilemma has implied that we would have to hire and train our own staff, to extend responsibilities audaciously to people with little relevant prior experience. In the spring and summer of 1971, when a new professional staff had to be selected, this assumption led to the hiring of Jack Larkin and Grey Osterud, both of whom had been well trained in historical scholarship but neither of whom had much museum or school experience. (Grey had been a work-study intern at Sturbridge, and Jack a Head Start teacher for two years.) My own background, when I became director in May 1971, had been in college teaching and two years of work on Village interpretive programs, mostly for adults and university students. Since none of the three of us could be described as specialists in anything, it was decided to spread the responsibilities for administration, program develop-

ment and training among all three, and to avoid a hierarchical structure at all costs. It helped that the three of us were quite young (Jack the oldest at twenty-eight), and equally committed to this kind of political arrangement. From the start, it was assumed that our role was not to arrogate the experience of teachers, professors, consultants or even students to ourselves, we have always been better at responding to the articulated interests of others than at anticipating them. Thus, although a kind of 'whiz-kid" psychology was implicit in the establishment of a Museum Education staff, the intent has been to be inclusive rather than exclusive, to shape our program by advocating for the client in the museum instead of insisting upon our own special expertise. Despite the oft-expressed regret of other museum staff members that the Museum Education staff is not made up of "object people," or technical people, or school people, we have always felt it more important to define the characteristics of the staff group by its ability to respond to the client's problems rather than to insist upon our own ways of operating.

Two distinct trends have pushed the original staff group a bit away from its organizational prejudices. On the one hand, the work has become more highly specialized and diverse simultaneously, and while inexperience was quite easily distributed, experience was not. In the opening stages of each project, a brainstorming group could make significant contributions. But as a new tour idea, for example, was developed and implemented, not all could keep up with it equally. While we were watching for specialization to emerge from our failures, it crept in instead because of our successes. On the other hand, as the work progressed in 1971-72, the professional staff became overextended with the implementation of its new ideas. The provision of an assistants' level seemed like a good answer, and several even younger staff members were brought in to help. The assistants pushed the program even farther into specialization, especially as their work needed supervision and definition.

To make the tale even more obscure, perhaps, we began to realize that the collective responsibility for all aspects of the program left many details untended. And each of us needed to be able to follow a project through from beginning to end, at least occasionally, in order to get some more concrete sense of accomplishment ourselves. The result has been to accept some specialization of functions, to carve these out of the interests and skills of staff members, and to reserve the possibility of collective planning and individual diversification to the working of time. When Peter O'Connell joined the staff in March 1972, it was with the explicit intention of taking over the materials project, but Peter's skills in teacher training have led him since to supervising the escort staff and onto our teacher workshop staff. Grey's research interests led her, conversely, into the materials work. Jack has come to focus on day-to-day administration, while I've spent more of my time on staff planning.

The assistants' level positions have become similarly more specialized. Three of the Teaching Assistants in 1972-73--Virginia Westbrook, Pam Kramer and Helen MacDonald--have been given specific responsibilities for organizing

and training of escorts in the Homelife, Textiles and Farm studios, respectively. Virginia Bricker organized our previsit planning with teachers, Robert Post contributed to materials development and escort training, and Holly Sidford assisted on work-study and historical drama projects. In addition to expanding the effectiveness of the professional staff's time, the assistants' places have served two other ends. First, they provided a way for especially skilled escorts to take on more responsibility within the department, no small task if the obligation to provide a democratic working environment is taken seriously. And second, the assistants are prepared in this way to assume professional positions when these open. Pam Kramer, Ginny Bricker and Holly Sidford will move into such positions for 1973-74. In fact, seven of the ten full-time administrative staff selected for the year beginning September 1973 began at the Village at an hourly rate.

I have not included in this summary the two staff members--Alberta Sebolt and Russell Ferris--who have directed the Title III "Three-Dimensional Project." The teacher-training project, funded from outside the Village budget, has operated as an autonomous unit in collaboration with the Museum Education staff. With the expansion of our teacher programs in 1973-74, the project staff will be more nearly integrated into Museum Education. Peter O'Connell and Virginia Bricker will join Alberta in this new program after each has worked about eighteen months with other aspects of museum education.

In some sense, then, Museum Education has served as a museum training program. In our efforts to develop such a young staff, none of whom has had formal museum training of any kind and only two of whom had ever worked in another museum previously, we have been aware of the need to create an intellectual community within the department. The fallacy of most training programs is that their initiation into the theory and practice of museum work takes little account of the dearth of opportunity for museum employees to continue their study once hired. We have tried to send all of our staff out to visit many other museums and schools, to attend professional conferences (and to participate in panels), and to engage in a wide array of short-term museum and teacher-training programs. We've also tried to maintain a schedule of staff colloquia, at which issues of significance to our work could be discussed at length. And The Pedagogue's Panoplist, as an in-house critical review of our work, has provided a forum for an emerging dialogue about museums and education, as well as a convenient way to record impressions of all-too-ephemeral special programs. A weekly discussion group of escorts began in the spring of 1973, and soon became a rather exciting arena for a continuing reassessment of our teaching.

Ultimately, though, the problem needs greater attention. Museum education is so engulfed by ongoing program demands that an opportunity for analysis and reflection, or for serious scholarship, is glimpsed only occasionally. The museum, to maintain the dynamic of this department's growth, will have to make provision for regular chances to get away and read, not simply to catch up on Social Education or American Quarterly, but to research problems in women's

history or technological development or visual learning or the politics of school administration.

To some extent, this is now occurring. Pam Kramer combined study for an Ed.M. at Harvard with her work as a Teaching Assistant. Holly Sidford was able to spend a good part of six months researching historical drama with a grant from the Massachusetts Council on the Arts and Humanities. We hope Jack Larkin will be able to perform the evaluation study mentioned above, again with outside funding. For the present, though, it is simpler to leave than to incorporate study into one's work schedule. Grey Osterud is entering Brown University to get a Ph.D. in American Civilization in September 1973, and I will be on leave for a year to complete my own doctoral dissertation. One hopes that these spells away from the desk work--and its constant impulse to fill every week with special programs--can be made part of each staff member's career development in Museum Education. If the work is stimulating, then there must be time accorded to play out the questions generated; if not, the department's promise is a tease.

Museum Education at Old Sturbridge Village has grown into a large and diverse community. In May 1973, we had forty-four staff members, including seven administrative staff, seven teaching or administrative assistants, four secretaries, and twenty-six escorts and briefers. Here is a profile of the staff.

	Administrative Staff	Assistants	Clerical	Escorts & Briefers
Total	7	7	4	26
Female	3	6	4	24
Male	4	1	0	2
Age: 20-25	1	2		8
25-35	5	3	1	5
35-45	1		1	3
Over 45		2	2	10
Ever Married	5	5	4	17
Single	2	2	0	9
Parent	3	2	3	15
Born:				
Sturbridge area			1	2
Other New England	2	2	2	15
Mid-Atlantic States	3	3	1	5
Midwest	2	1		2
South				1
West		1		
Europe				1

	Administrative Staff	Assistants	Clerical	Escorts & Briefers
Went to H.S. in:				
Sturbridge area	1		2	4
Other New England	1	2	1	13
Mid-Atlantic States	2	1	1	6
Midwest	1	1		2
South	1	1		
Southwest	1	1		
West		1		1
Secretarial School			1	6
Higher Education:				
Some college		1	1	4
A.B. or B.S.	2	4		8
Some grad. work	1			2
M.A.	2	1		
Ph.D. candidate	2	1		
Taught Professionally	5	2		3
Museum Experience (short-term)		2		
Had other jobs before OSV		3	4	17
At home for many years before OSV		1	2	14
Worked in costume, OSV	3	2		3
Days per week at Museum Ed: 2				7
3				9
4		1		4
5	7	6	4	6
At OSV:				
Less than 1 yr.	1	2		9
1-2 yrs.	5	3	2	2
2-3 yrs.		3	2	5
3-4 yrs.			1	2
4+ yrs.	1	1	1	8

The chart shows that the escort group can be divided into two broad categories. One group, the ten over age forty-five, are all married women with children; most worked for a short time after marriage, stayed home to tend their children for about fifteen years, and came to work at Old Sturbridge Village as a second family income when their children had grown. They tend to work fewer days but have continued their work for several years. Another group, the ten under thirty, are usually college graduates, here for a year or two before graduate school, often single, and working longer hours per week. The administrative staff is more diverse geographically, clustered in their late twenties, and much more likely to have had graduate study. The number of women in administrative positions has grown from none to a majority in the past two years. In 1973-74, ten of the twelve administrative places will be held by women, which is an important political fact in a department and field so dominated by women teachers.

The creation of such a community is only the first step. Just as little of what has preceded has been mandated by the museum's requirements, so too its future growth is only a contingency. Will the museum be able and willing to support such work with decent salaries and wages? Will the staff be able to see even its administrative responsibility as directional, and claim more time for long-range planning and research? Perhaps most interesting, will the staff have the confidence to refocus the program around the concerns of its new "clients"? In the plans for 1973-74 are new programs to reach inner-city black children, a Saturday series for youngsters in the Sturbridge community, and a new publication to record the impressions of teachers, designers, photographers, historians, students, anthropologists, and others, who are involved with us in diverse ways. These visions are more difficult to conceptualize, more expensive to attain, than those which have gone before. Will their achievement, then, be true success?

Maybe it is because too many of us are historians, and have learned to be skeptical of American definitions of success; perhaps it is that we are wary of words like that, or that we are too easily reminded (in every day's newspapers) of the frailty of institutional achievements. In any case, I for one hope we never come to realize the entire fruition of such challenges. Next year's flowering may yet bring with it a more delicious fruit.

Richard Rabinowitz